DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 006 RC 015 583

TITLE	A Program Evaluation Model for Migrant Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	California State Univ., Fresno.
SPONS AGENCY	California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.; Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Nov 85
NOTE	65p.; For related documents, see RC 015 580-582. A product of the HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Data Analysis; *Evaluation Methods; *Evaluation Utilization; Higher Education; High School Equivalency Programs; Longitudinal Studies; *Migrant Adult Education; Migrant Education; *Migrant Programs; Models; Questionnaires; Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS	College Assistance Migrant Program; *HEP CAMP National Evaluation Project

ABSTRACT

This technical report outlines the evaluation methodology used to conduct the 1984-85 High School Equivalency Programs/College Assistance for Migrant Programs (HEP/CAMP) National Evaluation Project, with special emphasis upon how this methodology might be adapted to meet evaluation requirements of local HEP and CAMP programs. Section 1 describes two methods by which programs may evaluate outcomes using the national evaluation model: a longitudinal method of tracking groups of former participants from year-to-year and a quasi-longitudinal method allowing comparison of accumulative outcomes of groups of participants enrolled in different years. Also identified are student outcomes used to assess program impact in the national evaluation; ways to measure outcomes using program documents and survey items; types of program data that should be routinely maintained to simplify the evaluation process; and an effective, inexpensive student survey plan. Section 2 summarizes data analysis procedures, suggests how local programs may use such procedures to develop and maintain a longitudinal data set on their own participants, and provides suggestions regarding computer hardware and software requirements. Section 3 presents a method for consolidating local HEP/CAMP program data into a nationally representative pool of information to serve local, regional, and national migrant education interests. Participant questionnaires in English and Spanish are appended. (NEC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED265006

RC015583

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gary L. Riley
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JAN 1986
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A PROGRAM EVALUATION MODEL FOR MIGRANT HIGHER EDUCATION

A Product of the HEP/CAMP
National Evaluation Project

NOVEMBER, 1985

PREFACE

The HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project of 1984-85 resulted in the preparation and distribution of three major research reports which indicate conclusively that Migrant Higher Education Programs have had a significant and positive impact upon the students served since 1980. The evaluation methodology that was utilized in this effort is different from other kinds of compensatory education evaluations in two ways: it was longitudinal in scope, and it focused upon the relationship between program characteristics and patterns of student outcomes.

While other written products of the National Evaluation Project focused on evaluation outcomes, this report focuses on the evaluation methodology itself. Program directors and evaluators who are familiar with techniques of survey research, data analysis, and statistical procedures will quickly recognize the similarities between this evaluation methodology and that used in conventional sociological and organizational research. It will also be readily apparent to experienced education evaluators that this design is quite different from pre- and post- assessment models that are often used to evaluate compensatory educational programs.

In the HEP/CAMP methodology, programs and not individuals are the primary units of analysis. Data obtained from students and staff members were summarized in various ways to form "program-level variables." While this approach does permit researchers to examine individual-level data, it also serves the broader purpose of exploring the relationship between program differences and patterns of student outcomes. To the extent that it is possible to adopt program features that are shown to be associated with higher-than-average levels of student success, evaluation methods of this type yield information that may be translated directly into program practices.

The primary purpose of this technical report, therefore, is to outline an approach to program evaluation which will supplement existing methods that focus upon immediate student outcomes such as improvements in basic skills, levels of motivation, and academic success. It is intended to serve as an introduction to longitudinal and multi-year evaluation design. And it will provide a methodological supplement to the three research reports that were prepared by the National Evaluation Project staff.

This document is not designed to teach project administrators how to design survey instrumentation, use computers to perform statistical analyses, or recognize the difference between an interval and ordinal measure. Although those skills are essential to research and evaluation, it is beyond the scope of this project to install those skills at the local project level.

The final chapter of this technical report outlines a method of transferring the evaluation methodology and longitudinal data analysis to local HEP and CAMP programs through a cooperative research effort involving several national associations and migrant education agencies. Having used this methodology to good effect, it is the recommendation of the National Evaluation Project staff to continue by any means possible the study of longitudinal impacts associated with HEP and CAMP program participation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview of the Technical Report 1

Section One: Evaluation Design Specifications 4

- Longitudinal Evaluation Designs 6
- Quasi-Longitudinal Evaluation Designs 6
- Measuring Student Outcomes 8
- Maintaining Program Data 11
- Student Survey Techniques 13

Section Two: Data Analysis and Technical Requirements 15

Section Three: Building A National Data Pool 21

Appendix A: Instrumentation 26

- Student Questionnaire (English version)
- Student Questionnaire (Spanish version)
- Referral Form (Spanish/English)
- Project Background Information Form
- Staff Questionnaire

OVERVIEW OF THE TECHNICAL REPORT

In October, 1985 the National Association of HEP and CAMP Programs announced at its national conference in San Antonio, Texas the outcomes of the HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project. The evaluation study included 21 HEP and CAMP programs in the United States and Puerto Rico, over 150 program staff members, and a sample of approximately 2,300 students who were enrolled in these programs between 1980 and 1985. This evaluation effort produced a set of nationally representative baseline data on program features, staff characteristics, and student outcomes which were reported in a series of three widely distributed documents.

The national evaluation was designed to meet the requirements for a longitudinal, multi-year, and multi-program assessment of student impact. Much of the methodology and instrumentation utilized in the national study is also applicable to the evaluation needs of individual projects, however. Therefore, the primary purpose of this Technical Report is to suggest how local HEP and CAMP project directors might adapt features of the national evaluation design to conduct local program evaluations. Additoinally, this report outlines how the National HEP/CAMP Association might collectively utilize the results of individual project evaluations to further develop and maintain the national data base.

The evaluation methods and products outlined in this document are not intended to supplant in any way the program evaluation requirements that are specified by the U.S. Department of Education. The model is merely suggestive of how programs might expand their current program evaluation practices by using the methods and instruments shown by the national effort to be effective in documenting the impact of program participation upon the populations served.

Section One outlines two methods by which programs may evaluate outcomes using the national evaluation model. The first is a longitudinal method which involves tracking groups of former participants from year to year. The second is a quasi-longitudinal method whereby a program may compare the accumulative outcomes of groups of participants who were enrolled in different years: class of 1980, class of 1981, and so forth. Both methods are effective in determining long-ranged outcomes of program participation, but there are advantages and disadvantages to each which will be considered in Section One.

Section One next identifies student outcomes that were used to assess program impact in the national evaluation effort and suggests specific ways to measure these outcomes using program documents and survey items that are contained in the instrumentation used by the national project. Focus then shifts to the types of program data that should be maintained on a routine basis by projects in order to simplify the total evaluation process. Finally, Section One outlines a student survey plan which is effective, yet is quite inexpensive to administer.

Section Two summarizes the data analysis procedures followed in the national evaluation effort and suggests how local programs may use these same procedures to develop and maintain a longitudinal data set on their own participants. Suggestions are made regarding computer hardware and software that are needed to perform the data analysis tasks which are comparable to those used by the national evaluation project.

Section Three outlines a detailed method of consolidating local HEP and CAMP program data into a nationally representative pool of information that would serve local, regional and national migrant education interests. Results of the national evaluation effort may only be replicated in part by

individual programs. The study of the effects of individual program features, regional population characteristics, and variations in patterns of program operation is only possible through the aggregation of individual project data into a national data pool. This concept is explored in some depth in Section Three.

Copies of this Technical Report were printed in two forms. Those distributed to program directors are bound in a three-ring notebook so as to provide a ready source of questionnaires and other instruments used in the national study. These may be duplicated as desired. The other version is conventionally bound and is intended to be used for reference only.

The ring-bound versions are divided into sections which may be supplemented with project evaluation plans, lists of objectives, other student survey forms, and the like. Each program director will also receive a set of printed documentation of the data file structures, codebooks, and raw data files assembled and used by the national project staff. This material will be provided in SPSS/PC format (the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, IBM/PC version 1.0 by SPSS, Incorporated, Information Analysis Systems, 1984). Although there are several computer software programs that may be used, the SPSS/PC file documentation will provide a model to follow in structuring system data files, data definition files, and variable definition files. Copies of this documentation and the raw data structures will be made available on 5¼" floppy disks to authorized agencies for data entry and data processing on IBM or 100% IBM compatible microcomputers. With appropriate communications software, these data definition and file structures may also be transmitted to mainframe computers for processing on SPSS-X or compatible versions.

SECTION ONE

EVALUATION DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS

There are many kinds of evaluation research currently in use at the local, state, and federal levels of compensatory education administration. Some of these are designed to account for the numbers of students that are served by programs, the scope of services provided, and the number of dollars spent in providing those services. The year-end performance reports currently submitted by HEP and CAMP programs to the U.S.D.E. are essentially of this type, supplemented in part by an accounting as to the number of students who complete program objectives.

Some compensatory education programs emphasize basic skill development and therefore utilize pre-treatment and post-treatment standardized tests to determine student growth and achievement. Results of this kind of evaluation may also be compared to local, regional or national norms to determine whether these program efforts are compensating for educational deficiencies found among eligible student populations. HEP and CAMP programs also use this type of evaluation, although rarely for comparative or normative purposes.

A third type of evaluation consists of studying the effects of program participation over time, perhaps extending several years beyond the time when students were actually enrolled in the program. The purpose of this type of evaluation is to determine the accumulative effects (impact) of program participation. Of all evaluation types, this longitudinal method is the most uncommon.

Programs that are intended to fully compensate for entry-level skill and other deficiencies like HEP (the GED) and CAMP (college level basic skill development) stand to benefit the most from longitudinal evaluations.

The positive effects of program participation such as improved income and career status, completing post-secondary degrees, and an enriched quality of lifestyle may not be achieved until several years later. One may assume that passing the GED and completing the freshman year of college will lead to these long-ranged outcomes, but conventional post-treatment evaluations are incapable of measuring the ultimate impact of these initial program outcomes.

The HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project sought to establish baseline (normative) data on the long-ranged outcomes of program participation by studying groups of participants who were enrolled in these programs as far back as 1980. Yet, even after five years, some participants are still making entry-level career decisions, are still enrolled in college, and have yet to achieve their self-declared educational and career goals. For some students, the final impact of program participation may not be realized for several more years.

For this reason, HEP and CAMP programs will benefit individually and collectively from adopting longitudinal evaluation practices similar to those utilized by the National Evaluation Project. These practices allow programs to define success in terms of behavioral outcomes and not simply in terms of the numbers of student who meet initial program objectives such as the completion of freshman year in college or passing the GED.

Longitudinal evaluation practices are not recommended in lieu of the performance reports and pre-/post-achievement testing practices that are currently utilized by HEP and CAMP programs. Rather, they represent an additional component in existing program evaluation plans. As is now the case, each program would continue to be responsible for designing an evaluation methodology that meets its own needs.

TWO DESIGN OPTIONS

Programs wishing to adopt longitudinal evaluation practices have at least two basic design options. One is a true longitudinal design and the other is a quasi-longitudinal design. Both are capable of generating long ranged impact data, but each has its own advantages and disadvantages as illustrated below.

Longitudinal evaluation designs consist of tracking a defined student population (e.g., all of those enrolled in a given program year) by means of administering a repeated measure of program outcomes over a period of several years. For example, students enrolled in 1985-86 might be mailed a survey questionnaire periodically (every other year) until 1990-91. The same procedure would be followed for members of the class of 1986-87 and all subsequent classes. While a program might compare the achievements of one class with those of another, the accumulative effects of program participation would be primarily determined by examining changes within each class from year to year.

Quasi-Longitudinal Evaluation Designs involve defining a cross-section of students served in several program years as was done for the National HEP/CAMP Evaluation Project. Rather than track each class year by year, the program would assess outcomes across all classes at the same time and would compare the outcomes of students who had been recently enrolled to those who were enrolled two, three, four, or more years previous.

The national evaluation followed this cross-sectional model. It was conducted in 1985, and included samples of students served in 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, and 1984. This design did not allow the evaluation staff to actually follow the progress made by each group of students year by year, but rather made comparisons of the relative progress achieved by each.

From a strictly scientific and statistical standpoint, the longitudinal evaluation design is preferred over the cross-sectional design. All of the growth data obtained with the longitudinal method are limited to one group at a time. Therefore, the evaluator does not have to be concerned about any differences between groups which may influence the relative rates of progress. In other words, using the cross-sectional approach, if the 1980 class were quite different from the 1983 class, any comparisons between the two would have to take these differences into account. Using a longitudinal approach, the evaluator is measuring change within groups and any group differences are largely unimportant.

On the other hand, cross-sectional designs are generally less costly to administer and they are easier to perform. Rather than doing three annual surveys to obtain three years of change data with the longitudinal approach, a program using the cross-sectional approach would only have to administer one survey every three years which would include students who were enrolled one, two, and three years previous.

A technical requirement of longitudinal research designs is that the same identical subjects (i.e., students) must participate each and every time that a new survey is administered. If 50 students out of a sample of 100 respond to the first survey, only those 50 are included in the second survey. If only 25 of the group of 50 respond to the second survey, only those 25 may be included in the third survey. True longitudinal designs are utterly dependent upon a high rate of continuous participation by all of the original sample. Follow-through to insure continuous participation is costly--both in terms of time and money. Therefore, most researchers seeking long-ranged outcome data use the multi-year (quasi-longitudinal) approach like that utilized in the national evaluation project.

MEASURING STUDENT OUTCOMES

The HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project surveyed former students to obtain three specific kinds of information: data pertaining to the backgrounds of students and their families; opinions about selected program characteristics; and self-assessments of the extent to which educational and career outcomes had been/were being reached. A questionnaire was developed for this purpose and was printed in two versions: in English and in Spanish. Copies of both are included in Appendix A of the Handbook and may be duplicated in whole or in part for local applications.

Participant background information such as family education, ethnic identity, age, and gender was used to determine whether such factors are associated with different patterns of program outcomes. Indeed, in some cases they are associated with different outcomes and should be included in a project's data scheme.

Student opinions about program features were used to describe some of the distinguishing characteristics of successful projects. Additionally, this information was used to help explain some of the differences found in program success rates. Although local programs will not necessarily have access to comparable data from other projects, program evaluators may use this kind of data to determine the relative strengths and weaknesses of two or more program years.

The primary focus of the national evaluation was upon determining the extent of program outcome success. Four indicators of program outcomes were used to determine impact: the completion of the GED (for the HEP student population) and the completion of the first year of college (for CAMP students); the completion of one or more postsecondary educational degrees; one's employment status at the time of the survey; and annual

income status. At minimum, any local program effort to replicate national evaluation data at the individual project level should include these four measures of program outcomes along with the student background and opinion data discussed previously.

A list of the questionnaire items used to measure outcome success may be made by examining the data tables in Research Reports numbers 1, 2, and 3 and identifying those items in the Student Questionnaire contained in Appendix A of this Technical Report.

The national evaluation concluded that some students do not complete the GED or the first year of college while enrolled in HEP or CAMP, but do so at a later time. Therefore, if exit surveys or year-end results are the only source of this information, programs are under-reporting their overall success in achieving these initial objectives by as much as 10% on an annual basis. This is yet another important reason for doing longitudinal evaluations.

The national study found that most students who do go on to complete the GED or their first year of college after leaving HEP or CAMP usually do so within two years of the time they were enrolled, suggesting that it is probably not necessary to begin the first round of surveys until at two years after students have completed the program. That is, one would not survey 1985-86 enrollees before the fall of 1987.

From the data obtained in the national study, few significant changes in employment status and income should be expected among HEP students for at least two or three years following completion of the program. Many HEP students require at least that long to experiment with school and job options that become available to them upon passing the GED. In the case of CAMP students, four or five years are required before finding any who

have made significant improvements in their career and income situations. It simply takes that long to finish college and get a career-related job.

In this regard, extreme caution should be exercised when interpreting employment and income data, for one's employment and income opportunities are directly influenced by whether one is currently attending school. For this reason, the student questionnaire also includes items pertaining to one's current school enrollment status. When measuring program outcomes, it is important to qualify one's findings according to whether those being evaluated have had sufficient opportunity to achieve long-ranged outcomes.

In addition to these four outcome indicators, Student Questionnaires include items pertaining to the effectiveness of the program in helping one to develop basic skills, set goals, develop self confidence, and so forth. Student opinions regarding these areas of program effectiveness are useful when performing an assessment of program strengths and weaknesses, but should not be confused with other outcome measures. For instance, in a number of cases CAMP students reported that they did not complete their first year of college while enrolled in the program but nevertheless rated positively the effectiveness of the program in helping them to achieve high levels of academic skill mastery. These are distinctly different outcomes, and they must be dealt with as such.

This points out another advantage of longitudinal evaluations: it is possible to verify student perceptions of program effectiveness obtained at the conclusion of a program experience by comparing those perceptions to subsequent behavioral outcomes. Program evaluators may use this technique to compare immediate outcomes and long-term outcomes, to develop more reliable measures of outcomes, and to validate current measures of student outcomes as reflected in program evaluation plans.

Finally, although the primary purpose of longitudinal data gathering is to document long-ranged student outcomes, student perceptions about program strengths and weaknesses may change over time and with opportunities to apply what was learned. Longitudinal studies offer excellent opportunites to measure any changes that may occur in students' ratings of program value between completing the program and several years later when program contributions have been put to practical uses.

MAINTAINING PROGRAM DATA

Although the emphasis in longitudinal research is upon gathering data over a long period of time, the success of these efforts often depends upon the scope and quality of baseline data gathered while students are enrolled in HEP and CAMP programs. For example, if programs do not maintain a file of permanent mailing addresses on the students served, survey efforts will fail. If programs do not maintain demographic data on those who were enrolled, it is impossible to determine whether the respondents are statistically representative of that population. If programs do not record students' ratings of program features at the time they exit the program, it is impossible to determine whether these judgments change over time and with experience.

All HEP and CAMP programs ask students to complete some kind of an intake form when recruiting students to the program. Most programs also require a formal application form which contains supplemental background information about the applicant's family, educational history, work history, marital status, eligibility status for participation in the program, income history, and so forth. Projects contemplating the use of longitudinal data gathering for research and evaluation purposes should review their intake and application forms and revise them to include student background items

comparable to those included in the Student Questionnaire. In that way, programs can compare the characteristics of one year's population to other years, and can compare survey repondents to the population from which they were drawn. Without these baseline data, it is impossible to tell if the populations being compared are statistically comparable.

Program staff also play an important role in evaluation, and a copy of the Staff Questionnaire used in the national evaluation is also included in Appendix A. Program evaluators may duplicate the Staff Questionnaire and use it in its entirety or in sections. It is recommended that staff be surveyed each year, even though their individual opinions of the program may not change significantly from one year to the next. Programs have a 10 to 12% average staff turnover rate from year to year, and this alone is sufficient reason to re-survey staff annually.

The Staff Questionnaire includes opinion items that directly correspond to opinion items included in the Student Questionnaire. Thus, staff opinions on several program features may be compared to student opinions for the same year. While not essential for longitudinal analysis, this type of comparison points out similarities and differences in the ways that staff and students view the program. Programs may also wish to do an item comparison between staff who are basically <u>instructional</u> support and staff who are basically <u>counseling</u> support. These comparisons will point out some rather interesting differences in how staff with different professional orientations tend to evaluate what is important and what is not in a given program. Evaluators who routinely include staff opinions and ratings in their year-end analysis of program strengths and weaknesses will probably stop using staff averages of these ratings because the differences between groups are significant.

Programs are encouraged to update student mailing lists as often as possible. The single greatest problem in surveying adult migrant populations is obtaining current mailing addresses. As a safeguard, programs should always insist on having a "permanent mailing address" on record for each student enrolled. This is the address of a family member who will always know the student's current address. Over 10% of the national evaluation responses came from referrals provided by such family members.

STUDENT SURVEY TECHNIQUES

Due to the relatively small number of participants involved each year in individual HEP and CAMP programs, it is strongly recommended that all students be included in evaluation surveys. For reasons best explained in the context of a statistics or survey research design textbook, problems of some significance arise when dealing with relatively small samples. These cannot be avoided entirely, but their negative effects upon the distribution of data can be minimized in HEP and CAMP groups by starting with a 100% sample and doing everything possible to insure a response rate of nothing less than 40 percent.

Response rates will be improved by following a three-wave technique as follows. First, mail a letter to all participants stating that they have been selected to participate in the program evaluation. Indicate that they will soon receive a survey questionnaire, that you seek only an anonymous response, and that time is of the essence. Include in the first-wave letter a copy of the sample form in Appendix A which requests whoever opens the envelope to return it to you with the student's current address. As indicated earlier in this section, about 10% of the total national responses were obtained by this referral method when the student was no longer at the mailing address provided by the program.

Within two weeks of mailing the first letter, send the Student Questionnaire and be sure to enclose a stamped, return envelope. Do not fold the questionnaire. Although they cost a bit more, 8½ X 11" envelopes are preferred for a number of practical as well as aesthetic reasons.

On the average, the returns will "peak" within one week of the day that the questionnaires are received by the participants. Therefore, two weeks after mailing the questionnaires send a follow-up letter to everyone who has not responded urging them to do so as soon as possible. If the project can afford it, it is even more effective to enclose a second copy of the questionnaire. The three-wave technique should result in a response rate between 50 and 65% on the average--assuming that mailing addresses are accurate.

Although the questionnaire is anonymous, it is necessary to enter a coded identification number on the instrument or on the return envelope so that respondents' names can be checked off as the instruments come in. This is absolutely essential in the case of longitudinal designs where only those responding to the survey are included in the subsequent sample(s).

An ID number should include the YEAR of enollment and a UNIQUE ID number for each student: 83-01. In this way, respondents can be sorted into program years using only the ID number. It allows programs to keep track of response rates without having to process information that is inside the questionnaire form itself.

Although some programs may wish to conduct annual follow-through surveys just to keep in touch with their students, actually there is very little to be gained from surveying HEP and CAMP students more often than every two years. In most cases, surveying on a three year cycle would be quite effective and would hold costs to a minimum.

SECTION TWO

DATA ANALYSIS AND TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

Information obtained as a part of the national evaluation indicates that HEP and CAMP programs differ widely from one another in their technical capacities to deal with large-scale evaluation research. Some programs now utilize the services of University computer centers, some work with small data sets on microcomputer installations, and some do everything by hand on small electronic calculators.

So there is no misunderstanding: programs wishing to use the data gathering and data analysis methods of the national evaluation project are by definition involved in large-scale data processing! The questionnaires and project background forms include over 200 item-variables. When these items are summarized, aggregated, and converted from one scale to another (i.e., nominal, ordinal, and interval scales) there are over 650 possible indicators (variables) to work with simultaneously.

Working with data sets this large and this complex requires sophisticated computer hardware and software, detailed data reduction plans, and a keen sense of direction. Fortunately, there are many microcomputers in service today which have the technical capability to batch process large data sets. Software which has the ability to perform sophisticated statistical procedures is now available for most types of microcomputers. And printed documentation is generally of sufficient quality to allow the novice microcomputer operator to become quite proficient in under 100 hours of self-instruction and practice.

The data analysis performed for the national evaluation project was processed on a microcomputer with a 10 megabyte fixed medium (hard) disk drive, 384 kilobytes of Random Access Memory (RAM), an Intel 8087 high

speed math co-processor chip, and a single floppy disk drive. While this configuration was adequate, it should be considered the base minimum for large-scale data processing. Indeed, standard business computers today are often configured with 512 kilobytes of RAM and 20 megabytes of fixed medium storage, at minimum.

When selecting software for statistical processing of survey data, two factors must be considered: cost and ease of use. It is possible to buy a statistical package for virtually any of the popular microcomputers in use today for under $600 list price. These programs are capable of calculating means, frequency distributions, and simple correlations. All can perform one-way and two-way analyses of variance, and some will accept data files from other data-based management software programs. They are tediously slow, however. Calculating means for 100 variables may take as long as 20 minutes on certain microcomputers.

At the high end of microcomputer application software are statistical packages that start at about $1500. These are most effectively used in conjunction with data-base management or spreadsheet programs which are capable of accepting raw data, converting those data to system files, and transferring the files to the statistical package for processing. Using a software combination like this, the microcomputer on which the national evaluation data were processed required less than 5 seconds CPU time to calculate 100 means. More importantly, by programming the data entry screens to check for certain kinds of errors, data entry was performed by individuals who had no prior experience on microcomputers--with less than a 1% data-entry error rate.

Whether cost or convenience is the primary consideration, under no circumstances should a program make a software purchase without trying it

out in an actual application and on a microcomputer that is configured exactly like the one to be used by the project.

Whether working on a computer mainframe or a microcomputer, data analysis begins with printing simple frequency distributions to provide a clear picture of the data as they were actually entered into the file. Any oddities appearing in the frequency distributions (such as a variable value of "8" when the scale only included the values of "0" through "5") should be corrected in the raw data set. Most errors will be data entry errors. In some instances, however, the frequency distributions will reveal that a significant number of respondents failed to answer one or more questions. It may be necessary to drop those items from the analysis, for any missing values can drastically affect the overall distribution--particularly when the N (i.e., number of respondents) is small.

When satisfied that the raw data files are accurate, a comparison must be made between the characteristics of the respondents and those of the population served. Using the demographic data obtained on each program group while students were still in the program, calculate the distributions of those characteristics in the respondent population. If the comparisons show similarities, the respondent population is presumed to be statistically representative of the total enrollment. If there are discrepancies, the data may contain what is known as a non-respondent bias. In such cases, it is necessary to take corrective action. Anyone not familiar with the methods of correcting for non-respondent bias should consult with a statistician or a survey research design specialist before performing any additional data analysis.

For those who are not statistically-inclined, what this means is that you have a group of students responding to your survey who are not

statistically representative of the entire population served in a given year. You may have too many high achievers, too many men, too many who are currently enrolled in college, too many who are married. Most importantly you will not know whether these respondent differences are biasing your distribution of data. So, measure as many characteristics as you can in each program class, then repeat these measures in your survey. If the percentages of respondents with certain characteristics are about the same as the percentages of the total class with these characteristics, it is safe to assume that your data are representative. If not, seek technical help to learn how to "adjust" the scores of your non-representative respondent pool.

Assuming that the responses are representative of the groups served, a data analysis plan should be developed and implemented. The Research Reports 1, 2 and 3 of the National Evaluation Project reflect a straightforward approach: identify the student outcome variables that represent the educational and career objectives of the program; calculate percentages of students who met these outcome objectives; examine relationships between student outcomes and selected independent variables such as program and staff characteristics, student characteristics, and combinations of these.

Program evaluators perform this kind of analysis routinely, with the possible exception of correlating program, staff, and student features with participant outcomes. In fact, many programs compare outcomes from one year to the next. What, then, are the essential differences between what programs are now doing and the national evaluation methodology?

For one thing, multi-year analyses are a bit more complex and require evaluators to perform a series of identical analyses for each program-year studied. Consider the following statement: the average GED completion

rate for 1983 was 78% and the average for 1984 was 92%. But what if the 1983 rate of completion was based upon a 35% student sample, and 1984 was based upon a 75% sample? How might this difference influence the validity of that comparison?

Multi-year comparisons are dependent upon many factors, including the sample size, the response rate, and how the raw data are distributed around measures of central tendencies. If you are not familiar with such terms as measures of central tendency (various types of averages and the importance of standard deviations) and weighted responses (adjusting the individual scores according to response rate and sample sizes) you should consult a statistician before drawing any conclusions from the year-to-year comparisons growing out of multi-year analyses. These factors may not be influential enough at the individual program level to distort year-end data such as those now reported to the U.S.D.E., but they could easily alter conclusions drawn from multi-year comparisons.

Longitudinal analysis is even more complex, but depends essentially on the same kind of analysis that is performed on multi-year data sets. A major difference is that each respondent's data file contains information for each year studied:

JOE R. 1980.....1982.....1984.....1986...

Each year consists of <u>repeated</u> measures. That is, the same variables are included each year. With this feature, it is possible to calculate changes at the individual level from year to year.

For example, using longitudinal data, evaluators can show that 25% of a given HEP class completed a year of college within two years of leaving the program, and that 61% of those who did so went on to complete the Associate degree within two additional years. Longitudinal designs permit

evaluators to perform a type of case-study analysis of individual progress. The steps leading to different outcomes can be individually traced. This cannot be done directly (only inferentially) in a cross-sectional design.

In either case, year to year comparisons are possible. Programs that undergo changes in basic procedures can compare student outcomes to the program design features that were implemented during different program years. In this way, a new dimension is added to procedural assessment. Differences in outcomes that cannot be linked to other factors may well be the products of changes in program procedures.

Multi-year evaluations also provide programs with a source of cost-effectiveness data. By tracking student populations through educational and career advancements, estimates may be made of total cost and total gain (in taxable income). Although the national evaluation effort did not ask students to estimate educational expenses associated with post-program study, local projects might wish to consider such questions for purposes of doing valuable cost-benefit research.

These and other evaluation questions can only be addressed through the use of multi-year designs and longitudinal data analysis procedures. Although the cost and inconvenience of this added evaluation task should not be taken lightly, the methodology used in the national evaluation offers valuable information about program impact to decision makers at the local and national levels of HEP and CAMP administration. To implement this methodology requires new technology, resources, and personnel expertise. At the local level of program administration, the decision to implement the new methodology will also depend upon institutional support, Federal support, and the active involvement of the National HEP/CAMP Association.

SECTION THREE

BUILDING A NATIONAL DATA POOL

With little or no modification, the instrumentation and methodology of the National HEP/CAMP Evaluation Project could support a continued effort to maintain and expand the national data pool on migrant higher education and its long-ranged impact on participants. Such an effort would require individual program participation and cooperation, technical and financial resource capabilities, and a data processing center/clearinghouse serving the collective needs and interests of migrant higher education programs.

A COOPERATIVE RESEARCH APPROACH

Any effort to involve local HEP and CAMP programs in a continuing evaluation process should probably be approached in much the same way as was used to develop the National HEP/CAMP Evaluation Project. Under the sponsorship of the National Association, all HEP and CAMP programs would be invited to participate in a cooperative evaluation effort and would follow a uniform data collection schedule and evaluation methodology.

The strength of this effort and the data produced would be largely dependent upon involving a fully representative national sample of HEP and CAMP programs on a continuing basis. That is, a multi-year commitment is needed in order to produce longitudinal data; a representative sample is needed in order to produce a data pool which is comparable to that of the 1984-85 National Evaluation Project.

With 1984-85 defined as the baseline year, the student survey should be repeated again in 1986-87. The study would include students who were surveyed in the National Evaluation Project to determine continued career and educational advancements. Additionally, programs would survey the new students they served between July 1984 and June 1986.

Participating programs should administer staff surveys annually and maintain these data sets along with student permanent address records and other project documentation supporting the Program Background Form (see Appendix A). A uniform method of data storage should be adopted by all participating programs, possibly a data based management system (DBMS) that is capable of being installed and operated on all of the leading types of microcomputers (IBM, IBM compatables, and Apple).

The National HEP/CAMP Association, working cooperatively with the U.S. Department of Education, should coordinate individual project efforts by providing direction and leadership, operational guidelines, and certain kinds technical assistance. Members of the NASDME Evaluation Committee, evaluation consultants, and other migrant education agency representatives should also be encouraged to play a central role in the task force of the HEP/CAMP Association.

TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL CAPABILITIES

Individual programs electing to participate in the cooperative research project would have to anticipate that involvement when developing 1986-87 program proposals and budgets. The direct costs would vary somewhat by such factors as numbers of students served, number of years each program had been in operation, and the availability of microcomputer hardware and software. Most HEP and CAMP programs now have access to microcomputer hardware in their respective agencies or institutions. In some cases, this hardware would have to be supplemented with additional RAM, additional disk drives, fixed medium (hard disk) storage, and the like. In probably all cases, programs would have to purchase the software that was agreed upon by the Association in its cooperative research plan. Volume or group discount prices are available on virtually all of the software that

would be needed and would result in savings of up to 50% off list prices from many software vendors. Similar savings can often be realized when purchasing large quantities of memory chips, disk drives, math co-processors, and related peripherals. The Association would have to coordinate the process of obtaining estimates from hardware and software vendors in time to include those estimates in each project's 1986-87 proposed budget.

Information obtained through interviews with HEP and CAMP directors, from project background questionnaires, and during on-site visits suggests that there are vast differences among programs in terms of their technical capabilities to conduct large-scale evaluation research and to perform data analysis of the type required for the cooperative evaluation effort. Some project directors currently maintain sophisticated computer-based data and information systems, while others are still in the process of developing a series of paper-and-pencil forms on which to record data for evaluation purposes. Some directors have a great deal of expertise and experience with educational research, while others do not. Some programs receive a great deal of technical assistance from their host agencies or institutions, while others do not have ready access to researchers and statisticians. There is need, therefore, to provide technical assistance to programs wishing to participate in the cooperative evaluation effort.

Information and instrumentation contained in this Technical Report provide the basic raw materials with which to conduct multi-year program evaluations. However, the Technical Report is not a textbook on survey research or statistical analysis. Nor is it a guide to the selection and the purchase of specific types of computer hardware and software. Yet, the success of a cooperative evaluation project depends to a great extent upon these technical skills and capacities.

If the National Association of HEP and CAMP Directors and the U.S. Department of Education decide to implement a cooperative evaluation project, provision must be made for direct technical assistance. It should not be assumed that individual programs have the capability of performing the necessary tasks that will produce a usable (uniformly structured) national data pool.

HEP/CAMP TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SUPPORT CENTER

The HEP/CAMP National Association should place high on its 1985-86 working agenda the problem of transferring the technology developed as a part of the National Evaluation Project into local program sites. For the National Association to play an instrumental role in this process, it is first necessary to transfer the technology to the National Association itself.

Given sufficient resources, it would be possible to establish something like a national center for HEP and CAMP program evaluation or a clearinghouse on migrant higher education. Such a center could provide HEP and CAMP programs with a variety of technical services. Yet, such a method might tend to reduce the scope and importance of involvement of the HEP/CAMP National Association which would probably be viewed as a serious if not "fatal" programmatic mistake in the long run.

A preferred model is one which establishes on a short-term basis a Technical Assistance Support Center (TASC) working cooperatively with and under the sponsorship of the National Association. The role of the TASC project would be to develop linkages with other migrant education centers and/or associations for the purpose of utilizing data processing and dissemination capabilities already in existence to support the unique needs and interests of HEP and CAMP, while supplementing the overall research, evaluation, and dissemination activities of migrant education.

Additionally, during the period of its operation, TASC would install among the HEP/CAMP National Association leadership the technical capabilities that are needed to successfully coordinate the cooperative evaluation effort that was discussed previously.

TASC might be supported on a two-year basis, through the completion of the 1986-87 HEP/CAMP student survey and data aggregation. The goal of TASC would <u>not</u> be to establish iteself on a permanent basis, but to eliminate the need for its existence by transferring the capability and the responsibility for maintaining a national evaluation effort to the Association and to other migrant education centers, associations or agencies.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENTATION

Participant Questionnaire

HEP / CAMP National
Evaluation Project

NATIONAL HEP / CAMP ASSOCIATION

HEP/CAMP NATIONAL EVALUATION PROJECT
California State University, Fresno
Joyal Administration Room 224
Maple & Shaw Avenues
Fresno, CA 93740-0001

Dear Study Participant:

The National Association of HEP and CAMP Program Directors is conducting a study of all programs in the United States and Puerto Rico to determine how effective these programs have been and to discover ways that will make them even more successful in the future for students like yourself. As a former program participant, you have been selected to represent your program along with a small number of others. Your response to this questionnaire is very important to this national study.

Please read each question thoughtfully, and answer each one to the best of your knowledge. Your answers are totally confidential. Your name will not be used in any way. All of the questionnaires that are returned to us will be protected in the same way as other school and personal records.

It is important that you return the completed questionnaire to us as soon as possible. Thank you very much for your time and assistance in this national evaluation effort.

Raul Diaz
RAUL DIAZ
President, National Association

Gary Riley
GARY L. RILEY
Project Director

PART I. Please answer the following questions about yourself:

1. SEX: _____ Female _____ Male

2. BIRTHDATE: _____/_____/_____
Month Day Year

3. ETHNICITY:
_____ Asian American
_____ Black
_____ Hispanic, Latino, Chicano
_____ Native American
_____ White
_____ Other: _____

4. EARLIER MARITAL STATUS (When you were enrolled in the Program:
_____ Single, Never Married
_____ Married
_____ Separated, Divorced
_____ Other (Specify): _____

5. CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:
_____ Single, Never Married
_____ Married
_____ Separated, Divorced
_____ Other (Specify): _____

6. Did you have any children when you were enrolled in the Program?
_____ No
_____ Yes If yes, how many? _____

7. Do you have any children now?
_____ No
_____ Yes If yes, how many? _____

8. When you were enrolled in the Program, what language did **you** speak **most** at home?
_____ English
_____ Spanish
_____ Other (Specify): _____

9. What language do you **now** speak most at home?
_____ English
_____ Spanish
_____ Other (Specify): _____

10. Do you speak a second language (in addition to home language)?
_____ No
_____ Yes (Specify): _____

11. Where did you reside while you were enrolled in the Program?
_____ with parents
_____ with other family members
_____ with friends
_____ in my own house, apartment
_____ in dormitory or apartment (provided by the program)

12. How many brothers and sisters do you have? (including step-brothers, step-sisters, half-brothers, and half-sisters) _____

13. How many of your brothers have graduated from high school? (do not include the GED) _____

14. How many of your sisters have graduated from high school? (do not include the GED) _____

15. How many of your brothers have attended at least one year of college? _____

16. How many of your sisters have attended at least one year of college? _____

17. How many of your brothers have graduated from a four-year college or university? _____

18. How many of your sisters have graduated from a four-year college or university? _____

19. How many of your brothers and sisters have also participated in either a HEP or a CAMP Program? _____

20. Did your mother graduate from high school? _____ No _____ Yes

21. Did your father graduate from high school? _____ No _____ Yes

22. Where were you born?
_____ United States
_____ Puerto Rico
_____ Mexico
_____ Other (Specify): _____

23. Where was your mother born?
_____ United States
_____ Puerto Rico
_____ Mexico
_____ Other (Specify): _____

24. Where was your father born?
_____ United States
_____ Puerto Rico
_____ Mexico
_____ Other (Specify): _____

PART II. Please answer the following questions about your own education achievements and experiences: (IF YOU WERE ENROLLED IN BOTH, PLEASE ANSWER ALL OF THE QUESTIONS IN BOTH COLUMNS):

25. Which Program were you enrolled in? (Check BOTH if appropriate):

_____ I WAS ENROLLED IN A HEP PROGRAM (Answer all of the questions in this column)

HEP 26. Did you complete the GED while you were in HEP?
_____ No _____ Yes

HEP 27. If you answered "NO" to Question 26, did you complete the GED after leaving HEP?
_____ No _____ Yes

HEP 28. Are you now enrolled in school?
_____ No
_____ Yes, trade school
_____ Yes, community college
_____ Yes, four-year college
_____ Yes, other: _____

HEP 29. How many years of school have you completed since you were enrolled in HEP?
_____ Years (example: 1½)

HEP 30. Have your earned any of the following degrees? (Check all that apply)
_____ Associate (2-yr) Degree
_____ Bachelor's (4-Yr) Degree
_____ Graduate Degree

HEP 31. If you are not now in school, do you plan to enroll in the near future?
_____ I am now in school
_____ No, I have no such plans
_____ Yes, to obtain special job or career-related training
_____ Yes, to complete a college undergraduate degree
_____ Yes, to complete a graduate degree

HEP 32. When I was in school **before** the HEP Program, I usually earned:
_____ mostly A's
_____ mostly B's
_____ mostly C's
_____ mostly D's
_____ mostly F's

HEP 33. Since participating in the HEP Program:
_____ I have not attended school
_____ I have earned mostly A's
_____ I have earned mostly B's
_____ I have earned mostly C's
_____ I have earned mostly D's
_____ I have earned mostly F's

HEP 34. What is your ultimate educational goal?
_____ None at the present time
_____ To complete some college
_____ To complete a two-year community college degree
_____ To complete a four-year college degree
_____ To complete a graduate degree program

_____ I WAS ENROLLED IN A CAMP PROGRAM (Answer all of the questions in this column)

CAMP 26. Did you complete the entire first year of college while you were in CAMP?
_____ No _____ Yes

CAMP 27. If you answered "NO" to Question 26, did you complete your first year of college after leaving CAMP?
_____ No _____ Yes

CAMP 28. Are you now enrolled in school?
_____ No
_____ Yes, trade school
_____ Yes, community college
_____ Yes, four-year college
_____ Yes, other: _____

CAMP 29. How many years of college have you completed **including** the time you were enrolled in CAMP?
_____ Years (example: 2½)

CAMP 30. Have you earned any of the following college degrees? (Check all that apply)
_____ Associate (2-Yr) Degree
_____ Bachelor's (4-Yr) Degree
_____ Graduate Degree

CAMP 31. If you are not now in college, do you plan to enroll in the near future?
_____ I am now in school
_____ No, I have no such plans
_____ Yes, to obtain special job or career-related training
_____ Yes, to complete a college undergraduate degree
_____ Yes, to complete a college graduate degree

CAMP 32. While I attended college in the CAMP Program, I usually earned:
_____ mostly A's
_____ mostly B's
_____ mostly C's
_____ mostly D's
_____ mostly F's

CAMP 33. Since participating in the CAMP Program:
_____ I have not attended college
_____ I have earned mostly A's
_____ I have earned mostly B's
_____ I have earned mostly C's
_____ I have earned mostly D's
_____ I have earned mostly F's

CAMP 34. What is your ultimate educational goal?
_____ None at the present time
_____ Some additional college
_____ To complete a two-year community college degree
_____ To complete a four-year college degree
_____ To complete a graduate degree program

EVERYONE ANSWER ALL OF THE REMAINING QUESTIONS

PART III. Please answer the following questions about your current employment situation and your career aspirations.

35. Current employment status (check one):
_____ Unemployed, not seeking employment
_____ Unemployed, seeking part-time employment
_____ Unemployed, seeking full-time employment
(WHAT IS YOUR PRIMARY OCCUPATION WHEN EMPLOYED?): _____

_____ Part-time employed, not seeking full-time employment
_____ Part-time employed, seeking full-time employment
_____ Employed full-time
(WHAT IS YOUR OCCUPATION?): _____

36. What was your total **personal** income in 1984?
_____ under $6,000
_____ $6,000 to $9,999
_____ $10,000 to $14,999
_____ $15,000 to $19,999
_____ $20,000 to $24,999
_____ $25,000 to $30,000
_____ over $30,000

37. How would you compare your average yearly income to that of friends you grew up with?
_____ I probably earn less than most of them
_____ I probably earn about the same as they do
_____ I probably earn somewhat more than they do
_____ I probably earn a lot more than they do
_____ I don't know

38. How would you compare your current employment situation to that of friends you grew up with?
_____ most of them probably have better jobs than me
_____ my job situation is probably about the same as theirs
_____ my job situation is probably somewhat better than theirs
_____ my job situation is probably a lot better than theirs
_____ I don't know

39. Did you receive any career guidance while you were enrolled in the Program?
_____ No _____ Yes

40. Did you make a specific career choice while you were enrolled in the Program?
_____ No _____ Yes

41. If you made a career choice while in the Program, have you been successful in pursuing that choice?
_____ I did not make a career choice at that time
_____ I am very successful in that choice
_____ I am somewhat successful in that choice
_____ I was not successful in that choice

Part IV. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the number which most closely matches your opinion.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION
42. Participation in this Program really helped me to change my life in positive ways.	4	3	2	1	0
43. Without this Program, I never would have been able to achieve my educational goals.	4	3	2	1	0
44. Without this Program, I never would have been able to achieve my career goals.	4	3	2	1	0
45. This Program gave me the self-confidence that I needed to set higher goals for myself than ever before.	4	3	2	1	0
46. If I made the choice all over again, I would definitely choose to participate in this Program.	4	3	2	1	0
47. The Program emphasized the development of scholarly qualities (love of learning).	4	3	2	1	0

Part IV. Continued

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION
48. The Program emphasized the development of analytical skills (logic, reasoning).	4	3	2	1	0
49. The Program emphasized the development of social skills (making friends and getting along with others).	4	3	2	1	0
50. The Program emphasized the development of cultural identity (pride and respect for people who are like me).	4	3	2	1	0
51. The Program emphasized the development of personal identity (self-worth).	4	3	2	1	0
52. The Program emphasized the development of creative, expressive qualities (music, art, self-expression).	4	3	2	1	0
53. The Program emphasized the development of vocational and occupational competencies (skills to help me get a good job, to help me get ahead).	4	3	2	1	0
54. The Program emphasized learning things that are of practical value (useful in my day-to-day life).	4	3	2	1	0
55. The Program helped me to develop good study skills.	4	3	2	1	0
56. The Program helped me to develop good reading skills.	4	3	2	1	0
57. The Program helped me to develop good math skills.	4	3	2	1	0
58. The Program helped me to develop good writing skills.	4	3	2	1	0
59. The Program staff were sympathetic and understanding toward me and my problems.	4	3	2	1	0
60. Whenever I needed any special academic help, a Program staff member was usually there for me.	4	3	2	1	0
61. I usually knew exactly what the Program expected of me.	4	3	2	1	0
62. I usually knew exactly how well I was doing, (where I needed to improve academically).	4	3	2	1	0
63. The Program made me feel like I really "belonged."	4	3	2	1	0
64. My family supported my decision to participate in the Program.	4	3	2	1	0

Part V. Please answer the following questions about your Program experience.

65. Compared to others in the Program, I felt:
_____ less prepared academically
_____ equally prepared academically
_____ better prepared academically

66. Compared to others in the Program I was:
_____ less motivated
_____ equally motivated
_____ better motivated

67. Compared to others in the Program, I was:
_____ less competitive
_____ equally competitive
_____ more competitive

68. Compared to others in the Program, I was:
_____ less involved socially
_____ equally involved socially
_____ more involved socially

Part V. Continued

69. Compared to others in the Program, I was:
_____ less serious academically
_____ equally serious academically
_____ more serious academically

70. Compared to others in the Program, I was:
_____ less concerned about finding a good job when I finished
_____ equally concerned about finding a good job when I finished
_____ more concerned about finding a good job when I finished

71. Compared to others in the Program, I had:
_____ fewer responsibilities at home
_____ equal responsibilities at home
_____ more responsibilities at home

72. Compared to others in the Program, I had:
_____ greater financial difficulty
_____ equal financial difficulty
_____ less financial difficulty

Part VI. Please answer the following questions in your own words, and as accurately as you can remember.

73. HOW DID YOU FIRST LEARN ABOUT THE EXISTENCE OF THIS PROGRAM?

74. WHAT MADE YOU DECIDE TO APPLY FOR ADMISSION TO THIS PROGRAM?

75. IF YOU DROPPED OUT OF THE PROGRAM, BRIEFLY EXPLAIN WHY.

QUESTIONS CONTINUED ON BACK

Part VI. Continued

76. SPEAKING ONLY FOR YOURSELF AND IN TERMS OF YOUR PERSONAL GOALS, WHAT WAS THE PROGRAM'S **GREATEST STRENGTH**? (What did it do for you?)

77. SPEAKING ONLY FOR YOURSELF AND IN TERMS OF YOUR PERSONAL NEEDS, WHAT WAS THE PROGRAM'S **GREATEST WEAKNESS**? (Where did the program let you down?)

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

HIGH SCHOOL EQUIVALENCY PROGRAM
UNIVERSIDAD CATOLICA DE PUERTO RICO
Ponce, Puerto Rico - 00732

Tels. 844-2315
843-3265

Estimado (a) estudiante participante:

La Asociación Nacional de Directores de los Programas HEP y CAMP está realizando un estudio de nuestros programas en los Estados Unidos y Puerto Rico para determinar cuán efectivos han sido éstos. Uno de nuestros objetivos es descubrir maneras que los harían más exitosos para que otros estudiantes se beneficien en el futuro. Como ex-estudiante de HEP, has sido seleccionado, junto con un pequeño grupo, para representar tu programa. Tus respuestas a este cuestionario son muy importantes para este estudio nacional.

Por favor, lee cada pregunta detenidamente y contesta cada una de éstas lo mejor posible. Tus contestaciones serán totalmente confidenciales. Tu nombre no será usado en ninguna manera. Todos los cuestionarios recibidos serán protegidos al igual que otros expedientes escolares y personales.

Es muy importante que devuelvas el cuestionario completo tan pronto como te sea posible. Muchas gracias por la ayuda y el tiempo prestado para la realización de esta evaluación nacional.

Parte I. Por favor contesta las siguientes preguntas personales:

1. SEXO: ____femenino ____masculino

2. FECHA DE NACIMIENTO: _____/_____/_____
   mes día año

3. RAZA
   ____asiático
   ____negro
   ____puertorriqueño, hispano, chicano
   ____americano nativo
   ____blanco
   otra: _____

4. ESTADO CIVIL ANTERIOR (Cuando estabas matriculado en el Programa):
   ____soltero, nunca había estado casado(a)
   ____casado(a)
   ____separado(a), divorciado(a)
   ____otro (especifica): _____

5. ESTADO CIVIL ACTUAL:
   ____soltero, nunca había estado casado(a)
   ____casado(a)
   ____separado(a), divorciado(a)
   ____otro (especifica): _____

6. ¿Tenías hijos cuando estabas matriculado en el Programa?
   ____no
   ____sí
   Si contestaste sí, ¿cuántos?____

7. ¿Tienes hijos actualmente?
   ____no
   ____sí
   Si contestaste sí, ¿cuántos?____

8. Cuando estabas matriculado en el Programa, ¿qué idioma hablabas <u>más</u> en tu hogar?
   ____inglés
   ____español
   ____otros (especifica): _____

9. ¿Qué idioma hablas <u>ahora</u> más en tu hogar?
   ____inglés
   ____español
   ____otro (especifica): _____

10. ¿Hablas un segundo idioma? (además del idioma del hogar)
    ____no
    ____sí (especifica): _____

11. ¿Dónde vivías mientras estuviste matriculado en el Programa?
    ____con mis padres
    ____con otro miembro de la familia
    ____con amigos
    ____en mi propia casa o apartamento
    ____en la residencia del Programa HEP

12. ¿Cuántos hermanos y hermanas tienes? (incluyendo hermanastros(as) y medios(as) hermanos(as)) _____

13. ¿Cuántos de tus hermanos se han graduado de escuela superior? (no incluyas a los que se han graduado por medio de un examen de equivalencia) _____

14. ¿Cuántas de tus hermanas se han graduado de escuela superior? (no incluyas a las que se han graduado por medio de un examen de equivalencia) _____

15. ¿Cuántos de tus hermanos han asistido por lo menos un año a la universidad? _____

16. ¿Cuántas de tus hermanas han asistido por lo menos un año a la universidad? _____

17. ¿Cuántos de tus hermanos se han graduado de universidad? _____

18. ¿Cuántas de tus hermanas se han graduado de universidad? _____

19. ¿Cuántos de tus hermanos y hermanas han estudiado también en HEP? _____

20. ¿Se graduó tu mamá de escuela superior? ____no ____sí

21. ¿Se graduó tu papá de escuela superior? ____no ____sí

22. ¿Dónde naciste?
____Estados Unidos
____Puerto Rico
____Méjico
____otro (especifica): _____

23. ¿Dónde nació tu mamá?
____Estados Unidos
____Puerto Rico
____Méjico
____otro (especifica): _____

24. ¿Dónde nació tu papá?
____Estados Unidos
____Puerto Rico
____Méjico
____otro (especifica): _____

Parte II. Por favor contesta las siguientes preguntas sobre tu aprovechamiento y experiencias educativas.

25. ¿Estuviste matriculado en el Programa HEP de Puerto Rico?
____no ____sí

26. ¿Obtuviste el diploma de cuarto año mientras estuviste en HEP?
____no ____sí

27. Si contestaste "no" a la pregunta 26, ¿obtuviste el diploma de cuarto año después que saliste de HEP?
____no ____sí

28. ¿Estás ahora matriculado en la escuela?
____no
____sí, en una escuela vocacional, comercial o tecnológica
____sí, en un programa de adiestramiento
____sí, en una universidad
____sí, otro: _____

29. ¿Cuántos años de escuela has completado después que fuiste matriculado en HEP?

_____años (ejemplo: 1 1/2)

30. ¿Has obtenido algunos de los siguientes grados universitarios? (Marca todos los que apliquen)
____Grado Asociado (dos años)
____Bachillerato (cuatro años)
____Estudios Graduados

31. Si no estás ahora en la escuela, ¿planificas matricularte en un futuro cercano?
____actualmente estoy en la escuela
____no, no he planificado estudiar
____sí, para obtener un trabajo especializado o un adiestramiento relacionado con una carrera
____sí, para completar un grado académico que ya comencé
____sí, para completar estudios graduados

32. Cuando yo estaba en la escuela, antes de entrar al Programa HEP, usualmente obtenía como notas:
____mayormente A
____mayormente B
____mayormente C
____mayormente D
____mayormente F

33. Desde que participé en el Programa HEP:
____no he ido más a la escuela
____he obtenido mayormente A
____he obtenido mayormente B
____he obtenido mayormente C
____he obtenido mayormente D
____he obtenido mayormente F

34. ¿Cuál es tu meta final académica?
____ninguna hasta el presente
____completar algún tiempo universitario
____completar un grado asociado de dos años en una universidad
____completar un grado académico en cuatro años de universidad
____completar estudios graduados

Parte III. Por favor contesta las siguientes preguntas sobre tu situación de empleo actual y tus aspiraciones sobre una carrera universitaria u oficio.

35. Actual estado de empleo (marca uno):

____desempleado, no estoy buscando empleo
____desempleado, estoy buscando un empleo a tiempo parcial
____desempleado, estoy buscando empleo a tiempo completo
¿CUAL ES TU PRINCIPAL OCUPACION CUANDO ESTAS EMPLEADO?: _____

____empleado a tiempo parcial, no estoy buscando empleo a tiempo completo
____empleado a tiempo parcial, estoy buscando empleo a tiempo completo
____empleado a tiempo completo
¿CUAL ES TU TRABAJO PRINCIPAL?: _____

36. ¿Cuánto era el total de tu ingreso personal en el 1984?

____menos de $6,000
____$6,000 a $9,000
____$10,000 a $14,999
____$15,000 a $19,999
____$20,000 a $24,999
____$25,000 a $30,000
____más de $30,000

37. ¿Cómo tu compararías tu promedio de ingreso anual con el de los amigos que crecieron contigo?

____probablemente gano menos que muchos de ellos
____probablemente gano casi igual que ellos
____probablemente gano algo más que ellos
____probablemente gano mucho más que ellos
____no sé

38. ¿Cómo compararías tu situación de empleo actual con el de los amigos que crecieron contigo?

____muchos de ellos probablemente tienen mejores empleos que yo
____mi situación de empleo es probablemente casi igual que la de ellos
____mi situación de empleo es probablemente algo mejor que la de ellos
____mi situación de empleo probablemente es mucho mejor que la de ellos
____no sé

39. ¿Recibiste orientación sobre alguna carrera u oficio mientras estabas matriculado en el Programa HEP?

____no ____sí

40. ¿Tomaste alguna decisión respecto a una carrera específica estando en el Programa HEP?

____no ____sí

41. Si tomaste la decisión respecto a una carrera mientras estabas en el Programa, ¿has tenido éxito en la realización de la misma?

____no escogí una carrera durante ese período
____he tenido éxito en la decisión
____he tenido algún éxito en la decisión
____no tuve éxito sobre esa decisión

Parte IV. Por favor, indica en qué medida estás o no de acuerdo con cada una de las aseveraciones siguientes haciendo un círculo alrededor del número que más se acerque a tu opinión.

	Totalmente de acuerdo	De acuerdo	En desacuerdo	Totalmente en desacuerdo	No opino
42. La participación en el Programa HEP realmente me ayudó a cambiar mi vida en una forma positiva.	4	3	2	1	0
43. Sin este Programa, nunca hubiera podido alcanzar mis metas educativas.	4	3	2	1	0
44. Sin este Programa, nunca hubiera podido alcanzar las metas de mi carrera.	4	3	2	1	0
45. Este Programa me brindó la confianza en mí mismo que necesitaba para forjar metas mayores que nunca antes consideré.	4	3	2	1	0
46. Si pudiera tomar la decisión de nuevo, definitivamente volvería a participar en este Programa.	4	3	2	1	0
47. El Programa enfatizó en el desarrollo de cualidades escolares (amor al aprendizaje).	4	3	2	1	0
48. El Programa enfatizó en el desarrollo de destrezas analíticas (lógica, razonamiento).	4	3	2	1	0
49. El Programa enfatizó en el desarrollo social (hacer amigos, llevarme bien con otros).	4	3	2	1	0
50. El Programa enfatizó en el desarrollo de la identidad cultural (orgullo y respeto por la gente igual a mí).	4	3	2	1	0

	Totalmente de acuerdo	De acuerdo	En desacuerdo	Totalmente en desacuerdo	No opino
51. El Programa enfatizó en el desarrollo de identidad personal (autoestima).	4	3	2	1	0
52. El Programa enfatizó en el desarrollo de cualidades creativas y expresivas (música, arte, auto-expresión).	4	3	2	1	0
53. El Programa enfatizó en el desarrollo de destrezas vocacionales y ocupacionales (destrezas que me ayudan a obtener un buen trabajo y a seguir adelante).	4	3	2	1	0
54. El Programa enfatizó en el aprendizaje de cosas de valor práctico (útiles en mi vida diaria).	4	3	2	1	0
55. El Programa me ayudó a desarrollar buenos hábitos de estudio.	4	3	2	1	0
56. El Programa me ayudó a desarrollar buenas destrezas en lectura.	4	3	2	1	0
57. El Programa me ayudó a desarrollar buenas destrezas en matemáticas.	4	3	2	1	0
58. El Programa me ayudó a desarrollar buenas destrezas en escribir.	4	3	2	1	0
59. El personal del Programa fue amable y comprensivo hacia mí y mis problemas.	4	3	2	1	0
60. Siempre que necesité ayuda académica especial, un miembro del personal usualmente estaba disponible para ayudarme.	4	3	2	1	0

	Totalmente de acuerdo	De acuerdo	En desacuerdo	Totalmente en desacuerdo	No opino
61. Usualmente yo sabía con exactitud lo que el Programa esperaba de mí.	4	3	2	1	0
62. Usualmente yo sabía con exactitud como estaba trabajando (donde necesitaba progresar académicamente).	4	3	2	1	0
63. El Programa me hizo sentir que yo realmente formaba parte del mismo.	4	3	2	1	0
64. Mi familia apoyó mi decisión de participar en el Programa.	4	3	2	1	0

Parte V. Por favor, contesta las siguientes preguntas relacionadas con tus experiencias en el Programa.

65. Comparándome con otros en el Programa, me sentí:
____menos preparado académicamente
____igualmente preparado académicamente
____mejor preparado académicamente

66. Comparándome con otros en el Programa, yo estaba:
____menos motivado
____igualmente motivado
____mejor motivado

67. Comparándome con otros en el Programa, yo era:
____menos competitivo
____igualmente competitivo
____más competitivo

68. Comparándome con otros en el Programa, yo era:
____menos sociable
____igualmente sociable
____más sociable

69. Comparándome con otros en el Programa, yo era:
____menos dedicado académicamente
____igualmente dedicado académicamente
____más dedicado académicamente

70. Comparándome con otros en el Programa, yo estaba:
____menos interesado en conseguir un buen empleo cuando terminara
____igualmente interesado en conseguir un buen empleo cuando terminara
____más interesado en conseguir un buen empleo cuando terminara

71. Comparándome con otros en el Programa, yo tenía:
____menos responsabilidades en mi hogar
____iguales responsabilidades en mi hogar
____más responsabilidades en mi hogar

72. Comparándome con otros en el Programa, yo tenía:
____mayor dificultad económica
____igual dificultad económica
____menos dificultad económica

Parte VI. Por favor, contesta las siguientes preguntas en tus propias palabras tan exactamente como puedas recordar.

73. ¿COMO TE ENTERASTE POR VEZ PRIMERA SOBRE LA EXISTENCIA DEL PROGRAMA HEP?

74. ¿QUE TE HIZO TOMAR LA DECISION DE SOLICITAR PARA ESTE PROGRAMA?

75. SI TE DISTE DE BAJA DE ESTE PROGRAMA, EXPLICA BREVEMENTE EL PORQUE.

76. HABLANDO PARA TI MISMO Y EN TERMINOS DE TUS METAS PERSONALES, ¿CUAL FUE EL ASPECTO MAS FUERTE DEL PROGRAMA? (¿Qué hizo por ti?)

77. HABLANDO PARA TI MISMO EN TERMINOS DE TUS NECESIDADES PERSONALES, ¿CUAL FUE EL ASPECTO MAS DEBIL DEL PROGRAMA? (¿Dónde el Programa te falló?)

POR FAVOR, DEVUELVA ESTE CUESTIONARIO EN EL SOBRE INCLUIDO
A LA MAYOR BREVEDAD POSIBLE. MUCHAS GRACIAS.

****

IMPORTANT NOTICE

If the person whose name is on the label no longer resides at this address, you can help us very much by delivering this questionnaire yourself. If it is not possible for you to deliver the questionnaire to the person intended, would you please provide us with that person's current address? Simply fill out the questions in this box, and mail the questionnaire back to us in the enclosed envelope. Thank you very much for your assistance.

____ I DO NOT KNOW THE CORRECT ADDRESS
(Please return the questionnaire to us in the enclosed envelope)

____ THE CORRECT ADDRESS IS:

_____
NAME

_____
STREET APARTMENT

_____
CITY STATE ZIP

MY RELATIONSHIP TO THE PERSON ADDRESSED IS:

___Parent, Grandparent
___Other Family Member
___Friend or Acquaintance

****

AVISO IMPORTANTE

Si la persona cuyo nombre aparece en este sobre ya no radíca en este domicilio, usted nos podría ayudar entregandole este cuestionario en persona. Si por algún motivo usted no puede entregarselo, favor de proveernos su domicilio en el lugar indicado en esta hoja. Muchas gracias por su ayuda.

____ No sé el domicilio de esta persona (favor de regresarnos el cuestionario en el sobre incluido)

____ El domicilio es:

_____
nombre

_____
calle apartamento

_____
cuidad estado zona postal

Mi parentesco con esta persona es:

___Padre, Abuelo
___Miembro de Familia
___Amigo o Conodico

FOR PROJECT USE ONLY
_____-_____ FORM 01

PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION
HEP/CAMP NATIONAL EVALUATION PROJECT

DEAR PROJECT DIRECTOR:

This questionnaire seeks background information about your Project that is not readily available from other sources. To complete all of the items in this questionnaire, it may be necessary for you to consult with others at your institution or agency. For this reason, your Field Representative has provided you with this form well in advance of his scheduled visit to your project site.

If you have difficulty obtaining any of the information requested, or if it is unclear to you exactly what we seek in a particular item, please make a note of it and consult with your field representative when he visits your Program. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR VALUABLE ASSISTANCE IN THIS STUDY!

PART ONE: ORIGIN OF PROJECT

1. First Program Year that Project was Federally funded: 19____-19____

2. Including 1984-1985, how many years has this Project been operating at this agency/institution:_____Years

3. Who had PRIMARY responsibility for developing the first year proposal:
   ___Project Director
   ___Agency Grant Specialist
   ___Agency Administrator
   ___Agency Staff/Committee
   ___External Consultant
   ___Other:_____

4. Was the CURRENT Project Director in any way involved in developing the first year proposal?
   ___No ___Yes
   Describe Briefly:

5. Was an external advisory committee involved in planning the first year project?
   ___No ___Yes
   Describe Briefly:

6. Did the agency/institution commit resources to the first year Project?

CASH CONTRIBUTIONS: ___No ___Yes
IN-KIND RESOURCES: ___No ___Yes
Describe briefly:

7. Since the first year award, has the Federal funding for the Project been interrupted (discontinued)?
___No
___Yes (Answer the following):
For how long:_____YRS
During this time, did the Project continue to operate?
___No
___Yes HOW? ___Agency Funds
___State Funds
___Other Funds
[Specify]:

8. How many students has the Project served each of the following years:
1984-1985:_____
1983-1984:_____
1982-1983:_____
1981-1982:_____
1980-1981:_____

9. As originally proposed, was Project:
___Totally Residential
___Largely Residential (over 50%)
___Somewhat Residential (under 50%)
___Totally Commuter-Attended

10. Describe briefly any changes in the residential/commuter status of the Project since its first year:

PART TWO: PROJECT ORGANIZATION

11. Who has ultimate policy-making authority over the Project?
___Agency Chief Executive Officer
___Other Senior Line Administrator
___Project Director
___Other (Specify):_____

12. To whom does the Project Director officially report?
NAME:_____
TITLE:_____

13. Who is primarily responsible for evaluating the 1984-1985 Project?
___Project Director
___Agency Evaluation Specialist
___Third-Party, Outside Evaluator
___Other:_____

14. Does the Project currently have an External Advisory Committee?
___No
Why not:

___Yes
Describe Membership:

How often does the Committee meet:
_____Times a Year

15. Who maintains the fiscal records of the Project as required by Federal Regulations?
___Agency Fiscal Administrator
___Special Projects Fiscal Officer
___External Auditor/Accounting Firm
___Other:_____

16. What was the total Federal award for each of the following years:
1984-1985:_____
1983-1984:_____
1982-1983:_____
1981-1982:_____
1980-1981:_____
[PLEASE ASSIST US BY PROVIDING THE FIELD REPRESENTATIVE WITH COPIES OF YOUR LINE-ITEM BUDGET FOR EACH OF THE ABOVE YEARS]

17. Briefly describe any inadequacies in your current Federal award (areas of the approved budget where you think the Project suffers from a lack of funding):

18. Briefly describe any organizational or related administrative problems you may have which you would like to see corrected:

PART THREE: PROJECT STAFF RESOURCES

19. Director:

_____ Hours Per Week
_____ Months Per Year
_____ % Federal
_____ % Other Funds

20. Professional Staff Resources
PLEASE COMPLETE ONE ITEM FOR EACH OF THE PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS THAT THIS PROJECT CURRENTLY INCLUDES IN ITS BUDGET. Examples include Assistant Director, Coordinators, Instructors, Residence Supervisors, Recruiters, Placement Specialists, Counselors, Evaluators.

_____ _____ Hours Per Week
POSITION _____ Months Per Year
_____ % Federal
_____ % Other Funds

_____ _____ Hours Per Week
POSITION _____ Months Per Year
_____ % Federal
_____ % Other Funds

_____ _____ Hours Per Week
POSITION _____ Months Per Year
_____ % Federal
_____ % Other Funds

_____ _____ Hours Per Week
POSITION _____ Months Per Year
_____ % Federal
_____ % Other Funds

_____ _____ Hours Per Week
POSITION _____ Months Per Year
_____ % Federal
_____ % Other Funds

_____ _____ Hours Per Week
POSITION _____ Months Per Year
_____ % Federal
_____ % Other Funds

_____ _____ Hours Per Week
POSITION _____ Months Per Year
_____ % Federal
_____ % Other Funds

_____ _____ Hours Per Week
POSITION _____ Months Per Year
_____ % Federal
_____ % Other Funds

_____ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_____ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_____ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_____ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_____ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_____ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_____ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_____ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_____ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_____ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_____ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

21. Secretarial: _____Hours Per Week
_____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

22. Does the Project employ:
(check all that apply)
___Student Assistants as Tutors
___Student Assistants as Peer Counselors/Advisors
___Student Assistants as Residence Assistants

23. What would you estimate to be the "typical" annual turnover rate among the Project's staff, excluding hourly personnel and student assistants?
_____% Average Turnover Per Year

24. How often does the Project staff participate in staff development programs and activities?
___Not at all
___Once or twice a year
___Three to five times a year
___Six to nine times a year
___More than nine times a year

25. When recruiting for administrative and other professional staff, does the Project recruit:
___Locally only
___at least State-Wide
___at least Regionally
___Nationally

26. Does the Project make it a special point to employ former HEP and CAMP students for appropriate positions?
___No ___Yes
For what positions?
_____
_____
_____
_____

27. How many of the Project's full-time staff were formerly employees of the agency or institution?
_____Staff were former employees

28. Do professional-level Project staff have tenure rights or retreat rights at your agency or institution?
___No ___Yes, some do
___Yes, all do

PART FOUR: STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

1984-1985: STUDENTS

SEX:
_____Male
_____Female

MARITAL STATUS:
_____Married
_____Unmarried

ETHNICITY:
_____Asian American
_____Black
_____Latino, Hispanic
_____Native American
_____Southeast Asian
_____White
_____Other

AGE:
_____17 to 20 years
_____21 to 25 years
_____26 to 30 years
_____over 30 years

MIGRANT STATUS:
_____Interstate
_____Intrastate
_____Seasonal Farmworker

1983-1984 STUDENTS

SEX:
_____Male
_____Female

MARITAL STATUS:
_____Married
_____Unmarried

ETHNICITY:
_____Asian American
_____Black
_____Latino, Hispanic
_____Native American
_____Southeast Asian
_____White
_____Other

AGE:
_____17 to 20 years
_____21 to 25 years
_____26 to 30 years
_____over 30 years

MIGRANT STATUS:
_____Interstate
_____Intrastate
_____Seasonal Farmworker

1982-1983: STUDENTS SEX:

_____Male
_____Female

MARITAL STATUS:
_____Married
_____Unmarried

ETHNICITY:
_____Asian American
_____Black
_____Latino, Hispanic
_____Native American
_____Southeast Asian
_____White
_____Other

AGE:
_____17 to 20 years
_____21 to 25 years
_____26 to 30 years
_____over 30 years

MIGRANT STATUS:
_____Interstate
_____Intrastate
_____Seasonal Farmworker

1981-1982 STUDENTS SEX:

_____Male
_____Female

MARITAL STATUS:
_____Married
_____Unmarried

ETHNICITY:
_____Asian American
_____Black
_____Latino, Hispanic
_____Native American
_____Southeast Asian
_____White
_____Other

AGE:
_____17 to 20 years
_____21 to 25 years
_____26 to 30 years
_____over 30 years

MIGRANT STATUS:
_____Interstate
_____Intrastate
_____Seasonal Farmworker

1980-1981 STUDENTS SEX:

_____Male
_____Female

MARITAL STATUS:
_____Married
_____Unmarried

ETHNICITY:
_____Asian American
_____Black
_____Latino, Hispanic
_____Native American
_____Southeast Asian
_____White
_____Other

AGE:
_____17 to 20 years
_____21 to 25 years
_____26 to 30 years
_____over 30 years

MIGRANT STATUS:
_____Interstate
_____Intrastate
_____Seasonal Farmworker

29. Please provide your most accurate estimate (or count, if available) of the number of students who left the Program before completing their educational objectives:

	NUMBER	PERCENT
In 1983-1984:	_____	_____
In 1982-1983:	_____	_____
In 1981-1982:	_____	_____
In 1980-1981:	_____	_____

PART FIVE: TECHNICAL CAPACITIES

30. Does the Project have access to a microcomputer?

___No
___Yes, Project-owned
___Yes, Project-leased
___Yes, Agency-provided

IF YES, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING:
Manufacturer:_____
Model:_____
Kbytes of RAM:_____
Number of Floppy Disk Drives:_____
Any Fixed (Hard Disk) Medium:_____
IF YES, Total Storage:_____MB
Graphics Capability: ___No ___Yes
Monitor: ___Monochrome ___Color

MICROCOMPUTER INFORMATION CONTINUED

Place a check mark beside all uses that are currently made of the CPU:

___Word Processing
___Budget Preparation & Analysis
___Data Based Management (DBMS)
___Individual Student Evaluation
___Program Evaluation
___Instruction
___Other:_____

PLEASE NOTE: The rest of this questionnaire is optional. One of the objectives of this national evaluation project is to determine whether a uniform evaluation methodology for all HEP and CAMP Programs might be practical. If you like, you may discuss these matters further with your Field Representative, or give us a call at California State University, Fresno: (209) 294-2541.

31. Have you ever conducted a follow-up study of your former students:

___No ___Yes

IF YES:

What Year:_____

No. Surveyed:_____

No. Responses:_____

What kind of survey?

___Telephone
___Questionnaire

Results available?

___No ___Yes

32. Would you like to participate in a National Migrant Higher Education Data System?

___No ___Uncertain ___Yes

THANK YOU FOR YOUR VALUABLE ASSISTANCE

FOR PROJECT USE ONLY
_____-_____ FORM 02

PROGRAM STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE
HEP/CAMP NATIONAL EVALUATION PROJECT

DEAR COLLEAGUE:

Your Program was recently informed that it has been selected to participate in a National Evaluation of HEP and CAMP Projects. The evaluation is being conducted by leaders in Migrant Higher Education, including several Project Directors from different regions of the United States.

This questionnaire seeks information from all Project personnel who are employed in salaried positions, on at least 50% time assignments with the Project. If you do not meet both of these criteria, please return this questionnaire to the Project Director.

Although this evaluation is designed to obtain and analyze a large amount of objective information about each project's characteristics and accomplishments, it is also important to develop an "insight" into each project based upon staff opinions and perceptions. Therefore, many of the items that are included in this questionnaire are of a personal nature, seeking a view of the Program from your own professional perspective.

Information that you provide will be used only to develop a "project profile." Individual responses will not be separately analyzed or reported in any manner. Your answers are entirely confidential. THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN THIS IMPORTANT NATIONAL EVALUATION EFFORT.

PART ONE: INDIVIDUAL BACKGROUND

1. What is your current position?
   Position:_____
   Title/Rank:_____
   [If Applicable]

2. Primary Program Responsibility:
   ___Program Administration
   ___Secretarial/Clerical
   ___Instructional
   ___Counseling/Advising
   ___Student Placement
   ___Recruitment/Outreach
   ___Residence Supervision
   ___Tutorial Services
   ___Other:_____

3. Ethnicity:
   ___Asian American
   ___Black
   ___Latino, Hispanic
   ___Native American
   ___White
   ___Other:_____

4. Sex: ___Female ___Male

5. Educational Background:

   What is your highest level of educational achievement:
   ___High School
   ___Some College
   ___Baccalaureate Degree
   ___Some Graduate Study
   ___Master's Degree
   ___Doctorate

6. Special Credentials:

   Which of the following special credentials do you possess? (Check all that apply):
   ___Teaching Certificate
   ___Counseling Credential
   ___Administrative Credential
   ___Other:_____

7. Time in Current Position:

   How long have you been in your current position?
   _____Years and _____Months

8. Were you ever employed in a Migrant Education program before accepting your current position?
   ___No ___Yes
   IF YES:
   For how long:_____Years
   In what Program:_____

9. As a school-aged child, were you eligible to participate in Migrant Education Programs?
   ___No ___Yes

10. As a school-aged child, by standards of the time, was your family:
    ___High Income
    ___Middle Income
    ___Very Modest Income
    ___Low Income

11. What do you consider to be your first language (the one spoken most at home when growing up)?
    ___English
    ___Spanish
    ___Other:_____

12. Are you fluent in a second language (in addition to one indicated in Question 11, above)?

___No ___Yes

IF YES, which language?

___English

___Spanish

___Other:_____

PART TWO: PROFESSIONAL WORKLOAD

13. How many hours per week do you work for the Project?

_____Hours Per Week

14. How many direct student contacts do you have in an average day (number of students with whom you come in direct contact as part of your job)?

_____Direct Student Contacts/Day

15. How many hours per day do you work directly with students?

_____Hours Per Day, Average

16. How often do you do Project work at home?

ON WEEK NIGHTS	ON WEEKENDS
___Most Nights	___Most Weekends
___Sometimes	___Sometimes
___Rarely/Never	___Rarely/Never

17. Are you employed outside of this Project?

___No ___Yes

IF YES

___In this organization

___Elsewhere

18. On the average, how many professional conferences do you attend each year?

___Usually none

___One or two

___Three of four

___Five or more

19. On the average, how many times per year do you participate in staff development activities (seminars, workshops, training sessions, or courses taken for credit)?

_____Activities Per Year, Average

PART THREE: ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM FEATURES

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the number which most closely matches your opinion.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION
20. The Program emphasizes the development of scholarly qualities in students	4	3	2	1	0
21. The Program emphasizes development of analytical skills in students	4	3	2	1	0
22. The Program emphasizes the development of social skills in students	4	3	2	1	0
23. The Program emphasizes the development of cultural identity in students	4	3	2	1	0
24. The Program emphasizes the development of personal self-worth (identity) among students	4	3	2	1	0
25. The Program emphasizes the development of creative qualities in students	4	3	2	1	0
26. The Program emphasizes the development of career-related competencies among students	4	3	2	1	0
27. The Program emphasizes teaching things to students that are of a very practical nature	4	3	2	1	0
28. The Program enjoys strong support from the central administration of this organization	4	3	2	1	0
29. Staff morale is very high on this Project	4	3	2	1	0
30. The Project's basic objectives are clearly defined for all staff	4	3	2	1	0

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION
31. I am strongly committed to the purposes served by this Project	4	3	2	1	0
32. I am usually able to observe significant positive changes in students' attitudes toward education	4	3	2	1	0
33. I sometimes feel that we focus more upon Project procedures than we do upon Project outcomes	4	3	2	1	0
34. Local outside agencies have an influential role in this Program's policies	4	3	2	1	0
35. Local outside agencies contribute a great deal to this Project's success	4	3	2	1	0
36. The Project should establish stronger ties to other Migrant Programs in this region	4	3	2	1	0
37. By whatever criteria, I believe that the Project benefits a clear majority of the participants	4	3	2	1	0
38. More emphasis should be placed on staff development in the Project's day to day operations	4	3	2	1	0
39. Instructional outcomes are what <u>really</u> matter in a Program like this	4	3	2	1	0
40. Personal development is what <u>really</u> matters in a Program like this	4	3	2	1	0
41. Career-related skills are the things that <u>really</u> matter in a Program like this	4	3	2	1	0

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION
42. I am very satisfied with my current position; I would probably not leave it, even for a job that pays more	4	3	2	1	0
43. My current position will lead me to improved career opportunities	4	3	2	1	0
44. A major problem in this Program is the lack of adequate resources to really do an effective job	4	3	2	1	0
45. Students often join the Project without knowing what is expected of them	4	3	2	1	0
46. Federal regulations seem to often interfere with the Program's need for flexibility	4	3	2	1	0
47. Program needs and the local agency's policies are often in conflict	4	3	2	1	0
48. I participate often in making Program decisions which directly influence student outcomes	4	3	2	1	0
49. Staff have need for more feedback regarding program effectiveness	4	3	2	1	0
50. Staff should be given more personal feedback with regard to their performance	4	3	2	1	0

THANK YOU VERY MUCH!

PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE
TO THE FIELD REPRESENTATIVE

YOU ANSWERS WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL